

EXHIBIT 52

EXHIBIT 52

From: [Mascherin, Terri L.](#)
To: [Vu, Hong-An](#); [Ciliberti, Katharine R.](#); [Powell, Lina R.](#); [Sutton, Theresa Ann](#); [Debra I. Grassgreen \(dgrassgreen@pszilaw.com\)](#)
Subject: Follow up re. Privilege Motion
Date: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 1:31:28 PM

Hong-An:

Following up on our discussion this morning regarding the directions that Judge Montali gave to the parties at the hearing two weeks ago, we informed you:

- Uber will not take the position in this case that it lacked knowledge of information that its counsel at MoFo learned from Stroz during Stroz's investigation.
- Uber will not take the position that it lacked knowledge of facts learned by its litigation counsel through discovery in the Waymo litigation or the Google arbitration. We understand you are considering this and may drop your request that Uber be ordered to produce all communications with its litigation counsel.
- It remains our position that, both because Judge Montali directed this and because the law requires it, to challenge Uber's privilege claims, you should identify the particular documents that you are challenging so that we can review those documents and consider your position.
- We do not believe there is any legal basis for you to seek production of communications between Uber and its counsel providing legal advice (as opposed to just conveying facts), given that Uber has not put its attorneys' advice in issue.

Particularly given that Judge Montali ordered the parties to confer regarding objections to claims of privilege regarding specific documents, we think the most productive approach here is for you to identify the documents that you are challenging so that we can review those documents and consider whether we agree with your positions. We remain willing to meet and confer along those lines, or otherwise to attempt to limit the issues in dispute.

Regards,
Terri